

Poznyak, Svitlana

Adaptation of the "Tool for Quality Assurance of Education for Democratic Citizenship in Schools" - Two years of experience in Ukraine

Trends in Bildung international (2009) 21, S. 1-25



Quellenangabe/ Reference:

Poznyak, Svitlana: Adaptation of the "Tool for Quality Assurance of Education for Democratic Citizenship in Schools" - Two years of experience in Ukraine - In: *Trends in Bildung international* (2009) 21, S. 1-25
- URN: urn:nbn:de:0111-opus-50661 - DOI: 10.25656/01:5066

<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0111-opus-50661>

<https://doi.org/10.25656/01:5066>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Die Nutzung stellt keine Übertragung des Eigentumsrechts an diesem Dokument dar und gilt vorbehaltlich der folgenden Einschränkungen: Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use

We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document.

This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. Use of this document does not include any transfer of property rights and it is conditional to the following limitations: All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Kontakt / Contact:

peDOCS
DIPF | Leibniz-Institut für Bildungsforschung und Bildungsinformation
Informationszentrum (IZ) Bildung
E-Mail: pedocs@dipf.de
Internet: www.pedocs.de

Mitglied der


Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

Svitlana Poznyak

Adaptation of the "Tool for Quality Assurance of Education for Democratic Citizenship in Schools" - Two years of experience in Ukraine

February 2009

Contents

1. Introduction and background
2. Project description
 - 2.1. Project implementing agency (TDP)
 - 2.2. Pilot schools activities
 - 2.3. Project results and added value
3. Project evaluation by TDP and pilot schools
4. Challenges and future tasks

*Appendix 1: Next Steps in Implementation of the Tool for Quality Assurance of EDC in Ukraine
Project description*

Appendix 2: Sample pilot school self-evaluation report

1. Introduction and background

In April 2007 the Charity Foundation “Teachers for Democracy and Partnership” (TDP) received a grant from the Council of Europe for carrying out the project “Implementation of the Tool for Quality Assurance of Education for Democratic Citizenship in Ukraine” with the overall objective to promote implementation of the EDC quality assurance in general secondary schools of Ukraine by piloting the Tool for Quality Assurance of EDC.

The Tool for Quality Assurance of Education for Democratic Citizenship was developed by the Council of Europe and UNESCO as a response to the compliance gap between the EDC policies and practice in many European countries, which was the major conclusion of the All-European Study on Education for Democratic Citizenship Policies (2004).

Ukraine is not an exception, and the task to bridge the gap between the declarations of the education policy and actual practice in school as well as to study and coordinate EDC activities of different actors of education has been on the agenda of educators and other stakeholders for several years. This is why the implementation of the QA-EDC was an important and timely measure for the national education system that would promote further EDC development in school and could serve as a tool of improving school performance in general through increasing school administrators’, teachers’, pupils and other stakeholders’ responsibility for its everyday practice.

This was also proved by the findings of the Study of the Opportunities for Implementation of the QA-EDC Tool undertaken by the German Institute for International Educational Research (DIIPF) in 10 countries including Ukraine in 2006.

In 2007 the Tool was piloted in 6 schools of Cherkasy region of Ukraine and proved to have a considerable potential for improving quality of education in Ukrainian school through its democratization. It also demonstrated, on one hand, the need to raise EDC awareness of Ukrainian educators and develop their QA-EDC skills and, on the other, limitations of the QA-EDC Tool which provides rather guidelines than a detailed description of the QA-EDC technology and its implementation. Thus, the main conclusion of the project was the need both to adapt the Tool to the realities of the Ukrainian education system and to make it practical and accessible for the user.

To do this in 2008 TDP received the second 10.000 Euro grant of the CoE for the project “Next Steps in Implementation of the Tool for Quality Assurance of EDC in Ukraine”, whose description and analysis this case study is devoted to.

The case study is based on the CoE QA-EDC materials, project materials and reports, observations and discussions at the project seminars and training sessions, analysis of the pilot school self-evaluation reports and interviews with the pilot school administration and working group members, representatives of educational authorities and project team members.

2. Project description

2.1. Project implementing agency

The implementation of the project “Next Steps in Implementation of the Tool for Quality Assurance of EDC in Ukraine” was organised by *the Charity Foundation “Teachers for Democracy and Partnership”* (TDP). It is an NGO with the regional status. The TDP activities are financed by grants of national and international donor organisations and sponsors’ contributions and are focused on development and implementation of national, regional, local and international programmes aimed at promoting democracy and social partnership in education, implementation of innovative teaching programmes and teaching and learning materials, modern teaching methods, technologies and means of education.

The main strands of the TDP activities are

- adaptation and development of teaching programmes in citizenship education and promotion of innovative teaching methods;
- organisation of training, seminars, conferences and other events;
- production of publications (textbooks, teacher manuals, etc.);
- administration and implementation of international educational programmes.

These activities are mainly realised in the framework of the three programmes: the Street Law, Democratic Education Exchange Programme (DEEP) and Democratic Education to Modern School Project.

The information about TDP and its activities can be found on www.teachers.org.ua or www.esd.org.ua.

The project “Next Steps in Implementation of the Tool for Quality Assurance of EDC in Ukraine” was financed by the grant received from *the Council of Europe* and co-financed by local education authorities of the regions of Ukraine whose schools participated in the project as pilot schools. These were Cherkasy, Dnipropetrovsk, Kharkiv, Luhansk, Lviv and Volyn regions.

The project implementation was supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine as it was one of the activities envisaged by the Programme of cooperation between the Council of Europe and the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine for 2008. The Programme is an instrument to legitimise and coordinate bilateral Ukraine - CoE activities in the field of education, but its function is rather technical and should not be overestimated in terms of any direct influence on the national educational policy development.

To fulfil the three fold task of the project¹ TDP set up *the project team* of 6 expert – staff members and external experts – to work on the implementation of the project activities. These were:

- project coordinator (a TDP manager and trainer), whose tasks were to organise seminars, trainings and other project events, coordinate school self-evaluation and school development planning activities, as well as reporting and communication;
- 2 trainers (acting teachers and TDP trainers of citizenship education and school management projects) to conduct seminars and training sessions for the pilot school representatives;

¹ See Appendix 1 for the projects description.

- 2 scientific consultants (researchers of the APS of Ukraine in the field of social education and management of education) to develop seminar materials, project publicity and publications;
- project expert (researcher of the APS of Ukraine in the field of political socialisation) to provide expertise on QA-EDC technology to pilot schools and monitor its implementation.

According to the project proposal TDP selected through the competition *7 pilot schools* representing different regions of the country. *The selection criteria* were:

- experience in implementing citizenship education in school practice;
- interest and motivation to participate in the project;
- resources and opportunities including labour and time to ensure the implementation of the project activities.

The following schools were selected to participate in the project: Strilkovsk boarding school (Lviv Region), Slonitsevska gymnasium # 3 (Kharkiv Region), Lutsk gymnasium # 18 (Volyn Region), Krasni Luch school # 10 (Luhansk Region), Dnipropetrovsk school # 12, Dnipropetrovsk law lyceum (Dnipropetrovsk Region) and Cherkasy school # 17 (Cherkasy Region).

The activities of the selected pilot schools throughout the stages of the project implementation were supported by TDP through the organisation of an EDC and QA awareness raising seminar, a self-evaluation and a school development planning seminar, which provided information and training on EDC as the principle, means and goal of education, school self-evaluation and development planning methodologies and procedures.

The task of each seminar was, on one hand, to provide training to the participants in the three areas and, on the other, to equip them with knowledge, skills and support materials so that they could organise and carry out such activities in their schools and equip them with support materials.

For example, the participants of the EDC and QA awareness raising seminar were exposed to a short lecture on the theory of EDC and QA, interactive techniques aimed at improving their understanding of EDC and QA principles and motivation to implement them in their schools (e.g. debates “Citizenship education as the main aim of school”, discussion “What is a citizen?”, “What is a democratic lesson?”, etc.), presentation of the QA-EDC Tool and group activities on its analysis and action plan development. Besides this practical exercise the pilot school representatives were provided with recommendations and support materials so that they could apply the proposed awareness raising and motivation strategies in training their school staff.

The project team also provided on-line consultation and supervision of the pilot school activities in between the seminars in addition to providing materials and a detailed practical guide on the procedures and methodologies of self-evaluation and school development planning as well as the EDC-QA technology as a whole.

The pilot school administrators were offered a stipend² for the period of the project duration and stationary to be used for the project activities.

² Its amount per month equalled one tenth of their monthly salary.

2.2. Pilot schools activities

The pilot schools motivation to participate in the project was mainly based on the administration and teaching staff realisation of the need to self-evaluate the school performance, their willingness to improve it in order to raise the quality of school education and especially the what in Ukrainian is called “up-bringing”³ aspect of it, as well as the recognition of the role of EDC as one of the main tools to do this.

When asked about the reasons for their participation the pilot schools representatives also referred to the solution of the specific problems related to EDC such as

- lack of knowledge and experience in implementing EDC in school;
- acknowledgement of the problems with EDC implementation in school and need to find solutions;
- need to improve the quality of student self-government;
- building up school capacity to introduce EDC in all the strands and areas of school activities – curriculum, extra-curricula activities, school management and school climate;
- possibility to explore the difference in the approaches to EDC in school between eastern and western regions of the country.

Among the general reasons mentioned by the pilot schools representatives were expectations that the projects would help to

- communicate, compare their own work with that of the other schools, and learn from each other’s experience;
- change the traditional approach to school functioning and introduce innovations in school practice;
- survive and attract students to the school in the competitive education environment through introduction of new approaches and improvement of the quality of education.

The decision to participate in the project was taken at the teaching staff meetings of the selected schools after the administration who stayed in contact with the project implementation agency presented the project objectives, tasks and planned activities. In all the pilot schools the procedure was the same, and most of the teaching staff showed interest in the initiative and readiness to implement the QA-EDC technology in their schools.

The project on the implementation of QA-EDC in the pilot schools lasted for 8 months and **consisted of three stages**:

The first stage – informing and awareness-raising – included a number of training sessions to introduce the concept of EDC to the school teaching staff, students and parents. This was a necessary stage of the project implementation since there was a need to make sure that there is

³ The term “upbringing” refers to the educational influence on developing and modifying pupils’ behaviour through pedagogically organised models of interaction between school actors.

understanding of the EDC principles and approaches among the stakeholders before starting working on the QA-EDC technology.

The second stage – school self-evaluation – focused on setting up working groups to carry out the project activities and conducting self-evaluation through collecting information, its analysis and interpretation, formulating the findings and informing the school teaching staff, students, parents and other stakeholders of them.

The third stage – school development planning – aimed at conducting school development planning on the basis of the findings of the self-evaluation stage of the project, discussing it with the stakeholders, finalizing it and making it part of the general school planning.

The activities of the pilot schools in all the three stages of the project were mainly based on the materials of the seminars organised by TDP for each stage of the project implementation. These were methodological recommendations, questionnaires and handouts on how to conduct an interview, a focus group and others developed by the project team on the basis of the Tool for Quality Assurance of EDC.

The use of the Tool for Quality Assurance of EDC itself by the pilot schools was quite limited due to two main reasons:

- lack of copies of the Tool for Quality Assurance of EDC in Ukrainian⁴;
- theoretical character of the Tool and need to adapt it to the user to provide the concrete methodologies, procedures and evaluation instruments for the QA-EDC implementation.

The main agent of the QA-EDC implementation in school was a pilot school *working group*. It bore the most of the workload in all the three stages of the project.

The number of the working group members in different pilot schools varied from 10 to 17 depending on the objective factors such as the size of the school and the number of teachers and students in it, as well as the subjective factor – decision of the stakeholders on how big the working group should be to fulfil its tasks efficiently.

Such flexibility as to the quantity of the working group members and the right of each pilot school to take its own decision was the approach of the project team, which gave the schools recommendations but not rigid instructions as to the working group organisation, composition and workload division.

Hence, the qualitative composition of the pilot school working groups also varied. In all the schools the working groups included representative of the school administration, teachers (with the participation of a school psychologist and a social pedagogue⁵), students (representatives of the school and class student self-government bodies) and parents. In some of the pilot school working groups each of the mentioned categories was proportionally represented and in others

⁴ Translation, printing and dissemination of the Tool was organised in 2005 as part of the activities within the European Year of Citizenship through Education in Ukraine. The project was funded by the CoE and realised by the All-Ukrainian Association of Teachers of Social Sciences and Civic Education. A translated version of the Tool in Ukrainian can be found at <http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/education/edc/Documents%5FPublications/EDC%5FPack>.

⁵ Schools in Ukraine are supposed to have school psychologists and social pedagogues as their staff members. However, it often depends on the individual school policy, financial resources as well as the ability to attract a qualified professional.

one category (either students or teachers) exceeded the others. This, like the approach to the quantity of the working group members, depended on the specific vision of the school stakeholders on the scope and character of the project activities and labour division.

There was no unanimity in the pilot school approach to *the labour division* among the different categories of the working group members. The only common feature was to the role of the school administration as part of the project working groups. Their function was mainly organising and facilitating.

The actual activities were to a larger extent conducted by the two main categories of the stakeholders – students and teachers. In some schools the most of the workload in conducting self-evaluation activities (collecting information through document analysis, questionnaires, interviews and focus groups) was borne by the students, in others by the teachers. In some schools students acted on the student level, whereas teachers acted on the level of the teaching staff and parents. In others there was no such division and both students and teachers as working group members were equally involved in all the activities at all the levels.

In general one can speak of *the four involvement models* when it comes to the workload division within the working groups of the pilot schools:

- 1) students and teachers have different tasks in conducting training (students work with students, teachers – with teachers and parents) and both are equally involved in self-evaluation and school development planning activities;
- 2) students and teachers have different tasks in conducting training and self-evaluation activities: students give training to students and collect information from them with questionnaires and interviews in the self-evaluation process; teachers work with all the categories of the stakeholders – teachers, students and parents; parents work with parents; school development planning is done by all working group members together;
- 3) all categories are equally involved in all the activities of the 1st, the 2nd and the 3rd stages of the project;
- 4) collecting information through questionnaires and interviewing is done by the students on their own initiative, all the other activities of the information and awareness raising, self-evaluation and school development planning stages of the project are done collectively by all the stakeholders involved.

The category that was represented in the working groups but stands aside from the others is parents. There was a clear tendency proved by all the pilot schools practice to experience difficulties with parents' involvement. Their participation was not active enough in all the pilot schools; however the limits of their involvement were different in different schools as well as the factors that contributed to that situation.

The common factor mentioned by all the pilot school representatives is lack of time on the part of the working parents since most of the QA-EDC activities took place in their working time. This is why only parents that were not working could participate in the project working group activities and project activities in general.

Another factor which some of the pilot schools report of was unwillingness of parents to be involved and lack of initiative and understanding of the necessity of the QA-EDC implementation in school despite the EDC information and awareness raising activities organised for them at the initial stage of the project.

At the same time despite the fact that parents were not actively involved in the working group activities their attitude to the QA-EDC implementation project in general was not negative all together. It ranged from cautiousness in some schools to interest and active support in the others.

The attitude of pilot school teachers to the QA-EDC implementation was predominantly positive in all the schools. Most of the teachers showed interest, initiative and readiness to work on the QA-EDC implementation and demonstrated understanding of the issue, as well as motivation to improve students' achievements through better interaction in the process of education and, thus, to facilitate the work of the teaching staff and make it more effective.

However, some pilot school administrators report of the problems they encountered in motivating the teachers. The problems were mainly linked to teachers' professional qualifications and working experience, and could be represented by the two main trends, which, in the long run, have the same cause: attitude to change. These trends are:

- scepticism of young teachers (with teaching experience up to 3-4 years) about the project due to lack of professional experience and qualifications and hence unwillingness and not readiness to change the traditional approach to teaching and other educational practice (which they were still in the process of mastering) for the innovative type required by the project realisation;
- opposition of older teacher to participation in the project due to conservatism and the same unwillingness and not readiness to change the teaching approach they have already mastered.

As for the students they were the most active and highly motivated category of the stakeholder which demonstrated interest, care and enthusiasm in the course of the project implementation both as members of the working groups and as respondents and resource people in all the pilot schools without any exceptions.

They were also the most open group of respondents in the self-evaluation process unlike parents and teachers who were quite reserved especially during interviews and focus groups, but demonstrated more openness and frankness in their answers to the questionnaire.

All together by the estimation of the pilot school principals about 60 – 70 % of the school teaching staff and students participated in the QA-EDC project implementation both as members of the working groups and the respondents and resource persons.

So far *the major tangible outputs* of the QA-EDC project implementation are pilot school self-evaluation reports⁶ and school development planning programmes built upon the analysis of the self-evaluation results. These were the two main documents delivered to the TDP project team. Besides, the pilot schools provided photos, publications, brochures, training and video materials documenting their activities on every stage of the project implementation. They could be used by the agency and the schools in the process of project results dissemination, sharing good practice among schools and further promotion of the QA-EDC in Ukrainian schools.

⁶ See a sample pilot school report in Appendix 2.

2.3. Project results and added value

The results of the QA-EDC project proved to be useful and instrumental for improving the educational process in the pilot schools.

Analysis of the findings of the school self-evaluation allowed the pilot schools to see their strong and weak points and identify their causes. Presentation of the results to the stakeholders at the teaching staff, parents and student self-government meetings and their discussion helped the pilot schools reach understanding of the problems and their causes and develop a shared vision of the actions aimed at their solution, which then shaped school development programmes.

Speaking about the self-evaluation results most of the pilot schools admit that along with the weaknesses they expected to come out and which they were aware of, self-evaluation revealed the problems in the areas which the schools, teachers and management felt absolutely safe of before starting the project.

The most typical cases were:

- students' and parents' dissatisfaction with the conflict resolution situation⁷ especially cases of violence as a way of solving conflicts between students, and sometimes students and teachers as well as lack of conflict mediation training in school;
- students' concern of the decision making process in school and in class, their involvement in it and lack of discussions about important issues dealing with organisation of teaching and learning process, extra-curricula activities, students' leisure, their rights and duties at school as well as conflicts and their resolution;
- little attention to student initiative and formal role of student self-government in school: a typical example is formal but not actual involvement of student self-government into the school activity planning which results in the school plans which do not consider students' ideas and in the long run do not stimulate their initiative.
- insufficient application of the democratic methods of assessment such as self-evaluation, peer evaluation, assessment of projects and portfolios which presupposes equal consideration to both the process and the result of the activity.

The problems that dominated pilot school self-evaluation results were undemocratic character of school decision making processes and inefficacy of the student self-government, which is more a formality than an effective and influential partner in the decision making process. They became major strands for improvement and action in the school development planning for the pilot schools.

Other weaknesses and focal points of the school development planning identified by some pilot schools were strengthening EDC in the curriculum and its teaching as a cross-curricular theme.

Since the QA-EDC pilot schools have just finished the school development planning activities and only started or are going to start the implementation of the planned actions in the second semester of the current academic year, it is not possible to speak of any results of the QA-EDC

⁷ Fairness of assessment and treatment is a typical issue for a conflict situation with all the school actors involved which often leads to a confrontation between students and their parents on one side and teachers on the other. Bullying is a typical example of conflicts and violence among students.

per se. However, the process of the implementation of the QA-EDC project itself and the interaction of the stakeholders, which was a necessary condition for its successful realisation, have had an impact on the pilot school performance. It may not be visible enough for the project expert to track them, but they are noticeable for the pilot schools themselves, whose representatives when interviewed were quite positive about *the changes that have already taken place*.

Among the changes or rather indications of such changes mentioned by the pilot schools are:

- improvement of the general atmosphere at school which became more friendly and cooperative;
- development of the critical approach of school administration, teaching staff and student self-government bodies to one's actions and decision and their analysis on the basis of the QA-EDC criteria;
- more cooperative relationship and better interaction between teachers and students;
- more effective work of student self-government by getting more freedom and responsibility to act;
- more careful attitude of teachers to conflict situations in school and their resolution;
- improvement of the style of management on the level of school administration: decisions are taken collectively and are discussed at school council meetings;
- better informing of the stakeholders about the school administration decisions;
- acceptance of discussion as a means of solving disputable issues by the stakeholders;
- stakeholders' realisation of a strong need to raise the level of parents involvement in school management changing it from the traditional level of providing financial support to broader and more active participation in the decision making process.

In addition to the positive impact on the school practice, the implementation of the QA-EDC in Ukrainian school has a potential and *added value* for the development of the national educational policy.

First of all, it has an important contribution to further promotion of the policy with regard to education for democratic citizenship in all the strands of the school activities: curriculum, extra-curricula activities, management and school climate in general. The whole school approach to EDC facilitated by the QA-EDC implementation proves to be a most effective means of student citizenship competences development as well as a means of changing teachers' and parents' attitudes and developing their democratic interaction skills.

Secondly, QA-EDC is an effective tool of the development of the theory and practice of school management. It facilitates the ongoing reform of the school management system and development of the so called civic and government school management system which presupposes active involvement of all the stakeholders in the decision making process in school. This role of the QA-EDC was specifically underlined by the pilot school administration.

Thirdly, one can hardly underestimate the importance of the QA-EDC for the quality assurance of school performance in general. The school self-evaluation procedure existing in Ukrainian schools is mainly targeted at the formal and quantitative indicators of school performance whereas the QA-EDC technology requires studying, analysis and interpretation of the data to determine the causes and possible solutions of the problems identified as a result of self-evaluation. Thus, it provides effective mechanisms as well as additional information to raise the efficacy of the school quality assurance system in Ukraine.

Last but not the least, piloting and adaptation of the CoE QA-EDC Tool which represents the European approaches and practices in the area of EDC and school quality assurance provides further opportunities for European aspirations of Ukraine through integration of the European experience into the Ukrainian education policy and practice.

3. Project evaluation by TDP and pilot schools

The Charity Foundation “Teachers for Democracy and Partnership” and the QA-EDC project team are quite positive about the results of the project. They especially appreciate the opportunity to be involved in the QA-EDC project for two years in a row, which makes it possible to check different approaches to the project implementation in order to improve its results and make the QA-EDC an effective means of assuring quality of school education. This also enables the project experts to monitor the QA-EDC processes in the pilot schools to better adapt the European approaches described in the Tool to the practice of the Ukrainian schools and develop a technology of quality assurance of EDC in Ukraine.

While the first project on QA-EDC implementation in Ukrainian schools in 2007 focused on turning the QA-EDC guidelines, principles and recommendation presented in the Tool into detailed procedures and concrete self-evaluation and school development planning methodologies to make the Tool accessible for the schools, Next Steps in Implementation of the Tool for Quality Assurance of EDC in Ukraine Project (2008) concentrated on adaptation of the QA-EDC procedures and methodologies to the realities and needs of Ukrainian school and development of a technology of quality assurance of EDC supported with recommendations and materials.

Another specific feature of Next Steps in Implementation of the Tool for Quality Assurance of EDC Project was the approach to the selection of its pilot schools and the priority target group of the TDP project events. Unlike in 2007 when all the pilot schools represented one region of Ukraine - Cherkasy, in 2008 it was decided to involve schools from different regions of the country in order to overcome regional differences if any and facilitate the dissemination of the QA-EDC and the project results. The priority target group of the project seminars and training sessions was changed from the QA-EDC working group members in the 2007 project to the pilot school administration representatives with the aim to ensure their understanding and support of the project implementation in school.

The fact that the 2007 project pilot schools were no longer involved in the QA-EDC project activities in 2008 can be viewed as its drawback as it didn't allow following up the QA-EDC implementation in those pilot schools. However, in the view to the updated aims and tasks of the 2008 QA-EDC project such approach seems justifiable.

Thus, the second year of the QA-EDC implementation as compared to the 2007 QA-EDC project gave a specific opportunity

- to develop a QA-EDC technology for Ukrainian school and understanding of how to implement it in school practice;
- to realise that school administration should be the priority target group for seminars and training sessions as their understanding of the purpose and procedures of QA-EDC is essential for its effective implementation in school;
- to make pilot schools ready to share their experience in QA-EDC with other schools.

The conclusions made below represent the evaluation of the project “Next Steps in Implementation of the Tool for Quality Assurance in EDC in Ukraine” both by TDP and the schools which participated in it. They could also be used as the basis for planning further activities in the field of QA-EDC in Ukrainian schools. These conclusions are:

- the QA-EDC project made it possible to introduce the quality assurance of EDC to the schools in 6 different regions of Ukraine, which, in the future could serve as the QA-EDC sites for the implementation of the QA-EDC in Ukrainian schools on a larger scale;
- the project has raised the educators’ and other stakeholders’ awareness of EDC as one of the main principles of school organization and culture and had an impact on the pilot school teaching, management, climate and decision making practice by letting its main actors participate and interact in the QA-EDC implementation process;
- the work on the adaptation of the CoE QA-EDC Tool to the realities of the Ukrainian school has resulted in the development of a QA-EDC technology for Ukrainian school and a resource book (collection of materials) providing the user with detailed description of the procedures and school self-evaluation and development planning methodologies, which is supposed to facilitate mainstreaming the QA-EDC implementation in schools and delivery of a teacher training course in QA-EDC;
- school staff need training and qualified methodological assistance in implementing QA-EDC; such training and assistance could be given by the regional in-service teacher training institutes provided they get necessary expertise, resources and support of the regional and national educational authorities.

4. Challenges and tasks for the future

Although the QA-EDC project was successfully implemented and positively evaluated by the pilot schools, educational authorities, TDP and broader public which was reached thanks to the project publicity activities, its implementation faced up with problems and challenges which need additional consideration when planning further activities on QA-EDC and targeting at a broader range of schools and the teacher training sector of education.

These *challenges* mainly deal with school resources, government and methodological support of school activities, national policy in EDC and quality assurance in school. They are outlined below:

- *Time and resources:* apart from educational activities schools are overloaded with administrative responsibilities; hence, they have little time and labour resources to invest into extra activities like QA-EDC. Neither do they have enough financial support to invest in the project realisation.
- *Government regulations and support:* schools don’t have enough autonomy to decide for themselves what projects to implement and which of them should be their priority. Besides school participation in the project is not stimulated by the education authorities and completely depends on the school initiative.
- *Compatibility with the national educational policy:* the underlying approaches of the effective system of quality assurance in Ukrainian schools are different from those of the QA-EDC. Although the pilot school administration and teachers see the two systems as complimentary, it may take time to make this vision part of the educational policy.

- *EDC awareness:* despite the fact that citizenship education is defined as one of the priorities of Ukraine's educational policy and school education in particular and that considerable efforts have been undertaken to raise EDC awareness of the stakeholders, it is rather low especially among parents as proved by the QA-EDC project.
- *Methodological support:* since the QA-EDC Tool presents the guidelines of the QA-EDC in school but doesn't contain its technology per se, schools need practical recommendation and materials on how to implement QA-EDC – its procedures and methodologies. Their development, piloting and revision are time consuming activities, which slows down the QA-EDC implementation process.
- *Training:* school actors need special training to apply QA-EDC technology, especially to conduct self-evaluation and interpret its data. The content and the quality of school self-evaluation reports received by the project team proves that the pilot schools didn't give enough consideration to the data obtained in the process of self-evaluation, and their interpretation is somewhat formal and superficial. Lack of interpretation skills may be one of the main reasons for that.

With the view to these challenges *the future tasks* in QA-EDC implementation in Ukraine as seen by the project experts and its participants are the following:

- 1) broadening the scale of pilot schools using the 2008 project pilot schools as QA-EDC sites for the new schools;
- 2) monitoring the complete yearly cycle of QA-EDC implementation on the basis of the 2008 project pilot schools: self-evaluation (2008) – development planning (DP) programme (2008) – DP programme implementation (2008 – 2009) – self-evaluation (2009);
- 3) piloting, revising and disseminating the QA-EDC technology materials (resource book) developed by the project team;
- 4) introducing QA-EDC to the system of in-service teacher training institutes;
- 5) giving schools a chance to carry out peer evaluation;
- 6) promoting QA-EDC implementation on local, regional and national levels;
- 7) sharing experience of QA-EDC implementation and its findings with other CoE member states.

Appendix 1

Next Steps in the Implementation of the Tool for Quality Assurance in EDC in Ukraine

Project description

The Project “Next Steps in the Implementation of the Tool for Quality Assurance in EDC in Ukraine” is the follow up of the activities carried out within the project on the CoE QA – EDC Tool implementation in Ukraine in 2007. The latter identified the challenges which have outlined the objectives and the tasks of the follow up. They are linked to the motivation of stake holders to participate in QA – EDC, the need in continuous awareness raising activities and development of the methodology and procedures for conducting self-evaluation, processing and interpreting its results, as well as recommendations on how to use them for school development planning.

Thus, **the overall objective** of the Project was to promote further implementation of the EDC quality assurance in schools of Ukraine through piloting and adaptation the CoE Tool for Quality Assurance in EDC and preparing a special methodological resource book on QA – EDC for schools and in-service teacher training institutes.

To reach the overall objective the Project activities were focused on fulfilling **the tasks**:

- to organize adaptation and pilot of the EDC quality assurance methodology in 7 schools of different regions of Ukraine in 3 stages:

1st stage: informing school educational staff about the QA – EDC methodology and motivating them to implement it in schools;

2nd stage: conducting schools self-evaluation by the pilot school staff with the consultative assistance of the project experts;

3d stage: conducting school development planning by the pilot school staff with the consultative assistance of the project experts;

- to train 14 school administrators to work with their school staff on the QA – EDC;
- to develop, print and disseminate the manual “How to Ensure the Quality of EDC in School” to be used by schools and in-service teacher training institutes.

The duration of the Project was 8 months (March – November 2008).

The main outcomes of the Project are:

- 14 school administrators were trained to use the QA – EDC methodology in schools;
- 300 teachers and 3000 students of the pilot schools were involved in the QA – EDC process and got experience in working with the QA – EDC methodology;
- 7 schools implemented the QA – EDC methodology in their school practice;
- information about the QA – EDC methodology and the project results was disseminated among educators of Ukraine through pedagogical press and Internet.
- the experience of QA – EDC methodology implementation and its findings were presented to the Central In-Service Teacher Training Institute of Ukraine;

- the manual “How to Ensure the Quality of EDC in School” was developed, printed and disseminated among schools and in-service teacher training institutes.

In the course of the Project the following **activities** were organized:

February 2008

- selection of 7 pilot schools in 6 regions of Ukraine: Lviv, Kharkiv, Volyn, Luhansk, Dnipropetrovsk, Cherkasy;
- presentation of the Project at the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine and Regional Education Authorities, coordination of the project activities and identification of the necessary organizational support;
- presentation of the Project in the pilot schools;
- preparation and dissemination of the information about the projects (press releases).

March-April 2008

- development of a training module and conducting a seminar (28 – 29 March) for the pilot school representatives on informing, motivation and encouragement strategies for school staff to participate in the QA – EDC;
- informing and motivating the pilot school staff and other stakeholders – students, teachers, parents – to participate in the project through pedagogical and methodological councils, training sessions, EDC information stands, involvement in the pilot working group, administration meetings, school council and parliament meetings, school web-sites, radio programmes, and parents’ meetings;

May – July 2008

- development of the methodology and procedures of the QA – EDC in schools on the basis of the CoE QA – EDC Tool;
- preparation of the materials for the pilot school self-evaluation procedure;
- conducting a 2 day seminar on school self-evaluation methodology for the pilot schools’ administrators in Kiev on 9 – 10 May;
- setting up and training pilot school evaluation teams composed by school teachers and students;
- conducting school EDC self-evaluation procedure by the pilot school evaluation teams using the materials and recommendations of the seminar on the self-evaluation methodology.

September – October 2008

- presentation of the school self-evaluation results to the pilot schools’ staff;
- getting feedback from the pilot schools and analyzing the pilot schools’ self-evaluation results;

- development of the EDC school development planning strategies and materials by the project experts;
- preparation and conducting a seminar (19 – 20 September) on school development planning for the pilot school administrators with the focus on how to make the SWOT analysis of the school performance on the basis of the self-evaluation results; how to identify the nearest development zones; how to use school development planning methodologies for EDC;
- conducting school development planning by the pilot school staff and other stakeholders;
- preparation of the manuscript and reviewing of the manual “How to Ensure the Quality of EDC in School”;
- publication of articles about the project and its outcomes in the educational press and on web-sites.

November 2008

- printing and dissemination of the manual;
- presenting the project outcomes to the Ministry of Education and Science, the Academy of Pedagogical Science, the Central In-service Teacher Training Institute;
- preparation of the project activity and finance reports.

Appendix 2

Sample pilot school self-evaluation report

Self-evaluation report of Lutsk gymnasium № 18

Schedule of self-evaluation activities

№	Plan of activities	Date	Responsible person
1.	Training of the working group in how to use self-evaluation instruments	12.05-16.05	Terekhova N.T. Chaika O.V.
2.	Questioning students, parents and teachers	19.05-23.05	Working group
3.	Processing of obtained information, identifying issues for individual and focus group interviews	23.05-25.05	Trofimchuk S. V. Romanenko O. K.
4.	Conducting individual and focus group interviews	26.05-31.05	Kochubei L. V. Shkred N. I.
5.	Summing up and finalising results of the interviews, comparing them with the data of the questionnaire survey	1.06-15.06	Working group
6.	Analysis of the school documents. Description of the current state of EDC in each indicator	15.06-30.06	Working group
7.	Presentation of self-evaluation results to the gymnasium staff at a teaching staff meeting	28.08	Skorohod S. A. Terekhova N. T. Chaika O. V.
8.	Preparation of the summary self-evaluation report	7.09.-15.09	Working group

*Analysis of the data of student, parent and teacher
EDC school self-evaluation questionnaires*

The survey was carried out in three spheres of the school activities – teaching and learning process, psychological climate and traditions and management (Appendix A).

The teaching and learning process was analysed on the basis of thirteen indicators - the first thirteen points of the questionnaire. Positive answers with regard to democratic style of teaching were given by the teachers themselves. In other words, we ourselves evaluate our own democratic teaching style very positively. Parents are on the second place: they are also of the opinion that the teachers of the school conduct lessons in a democratic way in terms of their attitude to students and to the teaching process itself. What raises concern is the fact that 18% of the students negatively evaluate classroom forms and methods of teaching applied by the teaching staff.

Thus, the summary of the school self-evaluation in the first sphere (teaching and learning process) can be presented in the table below.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encouragement of students to express their own opinion at a lesson 2. Teachers' respect of students' opinion 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Result of a student learning activity as a priority criteria of assessment by teachers

EDC level: *More strengths than weaknesses.*

School climate and traditions were analyzed on the basis of 14 indicators. The results of the analysis are similar to the previous ones. We, teachers, give the highest evaluation mark to ourselves. Parents come second. It's disturbing that some students and parents are not satisfied with the methods of conflict resolution, and that in the school there is no training in conflict resolution, which nowadays is provided by psychologists in almost all educational establishments of Western Europe. Part of the students of our school gives the answer "Sooner agree than disagree" to the question "Are there any cases of violence towards children at school?" And we have to admit that there are such cases indeed since we ourselves conducted a survey on that issue, and students even wrote essays on discussing disputable issues and situations in class.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School actors' knowledge of their rights and duties. 2. School actors' freedom of expressing opinion about the organisation of teaching and learning process in school 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Methods of conflict resolutions 2. Single cases of teachers' violence towards students

EDC level: *More strengths than weaknesses.*

School management was studied on the basis of 24 indicators. Positive answers with regard to democratic management of the school were given by 83% of the teachers, 67% of the students and 60% of the parents. We should further involve more students and parents in the school management and provide opportunities for encouraging their initiative. The priority task of our upbringing activities is correct organization of the school parliament activities and active involvement of students in the activities of student organizations, which, unfortunately, are of the nominal character in our school.

Why can't we see active involvement in the classes? The reason is that class parliaments are headed not by real leaders who can lead class collectives but simply good responsible students who prefer to do everything themselves rather than involve their classmates. Perhaps, we've rightly chosen the next priority issue for the activities of our pilot site and school as a whole: development of leader personality traits in the conditions of developing education.

Focus group activities

The analysis of the questionnaires showed a big polarity in the answers to the questions "Do members of the school staff recognize and take responsibility for their decisions and school development?" and "Is your opinion important for the school?". This is why to have an in depth analysis of these issues there were organized focus group interviews.

The questions for the focus group discussion were:

1. What decision making opportunities in school are created for the stakeholders?
2. What groups take part in the decision making process?
3. Is their participation in the decision making process real (as opposed to declarative)?
4. Do you personally take part in making decisions?

There were conducted student and teacher focus group interviews.

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Encouragement of school actors to participate in school management 2. Partner relationship between administration, teachers, parents and students 3. Joint school development planning 4. School development plan meets students', parents' and teachers needs 5. School actors' knowledge about the allotment of school resources 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of some school actors' recognition of personal responsibility for their decisions and school development

EDC level: *More strengths than weaknesses.*

Analysis of school documentation

The following documents were analysed:

1. Curriculum
2. School statute
3. School yearly plan
4. Minutes of the school teaching staff meetings

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The school statute contains EDC aims and principles formulated as general aims. 2. The school curriculum includes citizenship subjects and special courses: "We are citizens of Ukraine", "Human rights", "Fundamentals of law" and "International humanitarian law". 3. The school yearly plan envisages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • events aimed at involvement of all the school actors in the school management: joint meetings of the teaching staff and the school council; meetings of the trustee council, meetings of the students parliament, meetings of methodological units, meetings of scientific and methodological councils, thematic meetings of teachers, meetings of class teachers; • events for students aimed at learning about individual's rights and duties ("We and our rights", brain rings in law, briefing "Does my country need me?", debates 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The school yearly activity plan doesn't contain events aimed at improvement of school student self-government and studying student initiative on improving school life and life of the school district. 2. Most of the activities of the school yearly plan are aimed at organisation of teaching and learning process control, but not at studying teachers', students' and parents' wishes on how to make it better. 3. Students are not actively enough involved in team work on solution of some important tasks.

<p>“One should be proud to be a human being”, a competition of wallpapers dedicated to the Learning Law Month);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • introduction of the pilot course “Variety of world religions and cultures” aimed at development of tolerant attitude to representative of different cultures; • school self-evaluation, analysis of the activities carried out in the previous academic year. <p>4. The decisions of the teaching staff meetings demonstrate the fact that parents’ wishes as to school curriculum content, organisation of “profile” education in the school, introduction of some special courses and elective subjects are taken into consideration.</p>	
--	--

Conclusions

<p>Strengths</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. School actors’ knowledge of their rights and duties 2. Democratic management style 3. Democratic lesson 4. Teaching law and citizenship courses in the school, law, maths and linguistic profiles of education 5. The school development plan meets the needs of the students, parents and teachers 6. School actors’ knowledge about the allotment of school resources 	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. methods of conflict resolutions; 2. single cases of teachers’ violence towards students; 3. insufficient participation of the school actors in decision making and implementation processes; 4. lack of some school actors’ recognition of personal responsibility for their decisions and school development.
<p>Opportunities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cooperation with the town self-government bodies 2. Participation in international projects and international cooperation 3. Interest of government bodies and patrons in providing additional funds for school development 4. links with higher educational establishments. 	<p>Threats</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Indifference of the tenants of the city district to the school development 2. Low competitive opportunities of the school

Having conducted the procedure of self-evaluation in Lutsk gymnasium № 18 we conclude that we have *more strengths than weaknesses* (level 3).

Positions which constitute the zone of the nearest proximity are:

1. improvement of assessment of students at a lesson;
2. creation of necessary conditions for resolution of conflict situations;
3. involvement of all school actors in decision making;
4. organization of student self-government on the basis of the student initiatives;
5. involvement of students into the team work on solution of some tasks in school.

Appendix A

Statement ⁸	Agree %	Sooner agree than dis- agree %	Sooner disagree than agree %	Disagree %	Difficult to answer %
1. Students can openly disagree with their teacher's opinion at a lesson.	Students 34% Parents 58 Teachers 87	23 % 21 13	14 % 8 0	9 % 5 0	20 % 8 0
2. Students are encouraged to form their own point of view during a lesson.	Students 62 Parents 71 Teachers 82	26 21 12	2 4 3	0 0 3	10 4 0
3. Teachers respect students' opinion and encourage them to express it.	Students 59 Parents 50 Teachers 74	28 37 26	3 9 0	0 0 0	10 4 0
4. Students freely express their views in the classroom even if they are different from their classmates' views.	Students 64 Parents 66 Teachers 69	21 17 28	13 13 3	0 0 0	2 4 0
5. Teachers encourage students to discuss disputable issues.	Students 33 Parents 54 Teachers 72	21 25 72	10 8 26	10 5 0	26 8 2
6. When explaining lesson material teachers present several points of view on one and the same issue.	Students 41 Parents 41 Teachers 72	33 37 23	15 12 2,5	7 0 0	4 9 2,5
7. Teachers encourage students to assess their own achievements and take into account self-assessment results.	Students 51 Parents 54 Teachers 62	31 33 36	15 4 0	1 4 2	2 4 0
8. Students have an opportunity to assess each other's work.	Students 38 Parents 38 Teachers 62	26 32 23	28 12 5	7 7 10	1 12 0
9. The process of students' progress assessment by teachers is in most cases objective and transparent.	Students 36 Parents 12 Teachers 69	44 54 28	13 8 0	3 13 0	4 12 3
10. Teachers assess not only the end result of a task, but also student activities in the process of its solution.	Students 59 Parents 45 Teachers 79	26 25 21	13 8 0	2 5 0	0 17 0
11. Students work on the tasks given by teachers not only individually but also in pairs and groups taking common decisions.	Students 56 Parents 88 Teachers 74	28 12 23	7 0 3	7 0 3	2 0 0
12. Teachers involve students in role plays and project activities.	Students 49 Parents 75 Teachers 77	23 21 21	13 4 2	13 0 0	2 0 0

⁸ Statements 1 - 6 were taken from an IEA Civic Education Study questionnaire on open classroom climate (Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H. & Schulz, W. (2001) Citizenship and Education in Twenty-eight Countries. Civic Knowledge and Engagement at Age Fourteen, IEA, 237 p.).

Statement ⁸	Agree %	Sooner agree than dis- agree %	Sooner disagree than agree %	Disagree %	Difficult to answer %
13. The tasks solved by students promote development of their research skills.	Students 51 Parents 63 Teachers 82	26 21 15	13 12 3	13 0 0	2 4 0
14. You are aware of your rights and duties at school.	Students 77 Parents 54 Teachers 85	21 33 10	0 4 5	2 9 0	0 0 0
15. Your rights are respected at school.	Students 35 Parents 54 Teachers 46	45 17 46	18 17 5	0 4 0	2 8 3
16. School teaches you to defend your rights and respects the rights of others.	Students 56 Parents 45 Teachers 59	38 34 33	5 8 2,5	0 4 2,5	1 9 3
17. You have an opportunity to express your opinion with regard to the content and organisation of the school teaching and learning process.	Students 33 Parents 58 Teachers 49	26 26 36	23 0 10	13 8 5	5 8 0
18. There is an equal treatment of all members of the school staff and students and respect to those who are different.	Students 46 Parents 21 Teachers 41	26 25 38	18 13 15	10 16 0	0 25 5
19. School staff members and administration always observe human and children rights.	Students 41 Parents 63 Teachers 74	48 25 23	8 0 3	0 4 0	3 8 0
20. There are no cases of violence towards children in school.	Students 46 Parents 50 Teachers 66	19 34 26	8 4 5	26 4 0	1 8 3
21. Conflicts are resolved by the conflict parties themselves with the help of mediators on the basis of the principle of mutual interests consideration.	Students 56 Parents 54 Teachers 64	21 33 33	10 8 3	10 0 0	3 5 0
22. Students and teachers show readiness to peaceful resolution of arguments and to acting as conflict mediators.	Students 54 Parents 50 Teachers 56	33 42 44	8 4 0	0 0 0	5 4 0
23. School has a tradition of open discussion of conflict situations.	Students 51 Parents 50 Teachers 52	10 25 28	18 8 10	18 8 5	3 9 5
24. Conflict situations are used to teach mutual understanding, respect and protection of one's dignity.	Students 29 Parents 50 Teachers 78	33 29 48	18 0 2,5	13 4 5	7 17 2,5
25. You are always satisfied with the outcome of the conflict involving your interests.	Students 41 Parents 29 Teachers 26	18 50 62	23 8 7	1 8 0	1 5 5

26. School has a conflict resolution centre to serve both students and teachers.

Yes	No	Difficult to answer
Students 30	50	20
Parents 29	34	37
Teachers 78	8	14

27. School provides a course and training in conflict resolution.

Yes	No	Difficult to answer
Students 25	53	24
Parents 37	21	42
Teachers 34	26	40

28. Conflicts at school are resolved by mediation and negotiations.

Yes	No	Difficult to answer
Students 44	24	35
Parents 58	8	34
Teachers 85	0	15

	Agree %	Sooner agree than disagree %	Sooner disagree than agree %	Disagree %	Difficult to answer %
29. You consider it a duty to actively participate in the activities of the school community.	Students 46 Parents 33 Teachers 69	26 21 26	18 38 5	8 0 0	2 8 0
30. Students, teachers and parents are encouraged to participate in managing the school.	Students 28 Parents 47 Teachers 64	36 24 33	23 4 0	7 8 0	6 17 3
31. Representatives of the student self-government in the school self-government bodies have changed a lot for the better.	Students 36 Parents 33 Teachers 10	33 26 38	20 0 0	1 8 0	10 33 3
32. Student self-government bodies have an influence on everything that is going on in the school.	Students 38 Parents 8 Teachers 15	13 25 38	23 13 26	15 17 0	11 37 21
33. I am satisfied with my personal role in the school decision making process.	Students 36 Parents 38 Teachers 38	38 49 46	13 4 8	10 8 0	3 4 8
34. Every teacher can influence important decisions concerning school life.	Students 67 Parents 25 Teachers 20	26 29 46	11 4 12	1 8 7	0 34 15
35. Parents have an influence on school decision making process.	Students 36 Parents 33 Teachers 29	20 34 51	13 21 10	26 12 0	5 0 10
36. Students regularly participate in making decisions and freely express their views.	Students 41 Parents 33 Teachers 31	20 17 38	26 38 13	3 12 3	10 0 15

37. Principal strives to share responsibility with the school community members.	Students 51 Parents 38 Teachers 85	20 25 13	18 0 0	1 4 0	10 33 2
38. There is a periodical reporting on implementation of the approved decision to the school actors.	Students 38 Parents 67 Teachers 87	49 17 5	2 12 3	1 4 0	10 0 5
39. School management bodies involve all school actors in team activities and cooperation.	Students 36 Parents 54 Teachers 70	47 33 13	13 0 7	3 0 5	4 13 5
40. School principal treats all school staff members as partners.	Students 41 Parents 33 Teachers 79	36 25 18	6 0 3	7 4 0	10 38 0
41. School principal considers himself sooner a leader than the first person to exercise power in school.	Students 41 Parents 38 Teachers 46	33 12 26	10 8 0	3 12 8	13 30 20
42. If there is a conflict, school management gives preference to dialogue, debates and negotiations.	Students 31 Parents 63 Teachers 72	33 12 23	13 0 0	0 4 0	23 21 5
43. School staff members recognise and take responsibility for their decisions and school development.	Students 56 Parents 54 Teachers 74	38 13 21	6 4 0	0 4 0	0 25 5
44. Teachers work together on tasks and school development plans.	Students 41 Parents 37 Teachers 67	38 17 28	13 0 2,5	0 0 0	8 46 2,5
45. Your view is important for making decisions about the school life.	Students 28 Parents 13 Teachers 21	21 30 38	13 25 10	13 16 0	13 16 31
46. Each student's view is important for the school development.	Students 41 Parents 8 Teachers 26	23 33 38	21 25 18	10 13 3	5 21 15
47. There are discussions about the school problems in the school.	Students 46 Parents Teachers 72	41 23	7 2,5	3 0	3 2,5
48. Our school management is democratic.	Students 49 Parents 50 Teachers 69	36 25 21	1 0 5	1 8 0	13 17 5
49. The school development plan meets teachers', students' and parents' needs.	Students 36 Parents 46 Teachers 62	36 12 26	15 8 4	3 8 0	10 26 8
50. I know what important actions our school will take next year.	Students 15 Parents 42 Teachers 62	33 4 31	7 13 2	23 29 0	22 12 5
51. I know what important changes took place in the school life last year.	Students 41 Parents 63 Teachers 77	18 21 21	13 4 0	15 12 0	13 0 2
52. I know how school resources are allotted.	Students 21 Parents 42 Teachers 36	36 8 24	0 21 10	33 12 15	10 17 15
53. The school activity plan for the current year is its development plan.	Students 36 Parents 55 Teachers 80	46 4 15	5 13 0	10 8 0	3 20 5

Questionnaire analysis in each sphere

Teachers (total 38)

	Agree	Sooner agree than disagree	Sooner disagree than agree	Disagree	Difficult to answer
I sphere Statements 1-12	334 - 73%	108 - 24 %	10- 2%	1 - 0,3%	3 - 0,7%
II sphere Statements 13-28	363 - 60%	166- 27%	28 - 5%	18- 3%	33 -5%
III sphere Statements 29-53	520 - 55%	265 - 28%	58 - 6%	19 - 2%	88 -9%

Students (total 41)

	Agree	Sooner agree than disagree	Sooner disagree than agree	Disagree	Difficult to answer
I sphere Statements 1-12	236 - 48%	132 - 27 %	62- 13%	26 -5%	36 - 7%
II sphere Statements 13-28	290 - 44%	146- 22%	65 - 10%	93- 14%	62 -10%
III sphere Statements 29-53	398 - 39%	283 - 28%	135 - 13%	85 - 8%	124 -12%

Parents (total 41)

	Agree	Sooner agree than disagree	Sooner disagree than agree	Disagree	Difficult to answer
I sphere Statements 1-12	150 - 54%	77 - 28 %	22- 8%	9 -3%	18 - 7%
II sphere Statements 13-28	175 - 48%	85- 23%	25 - 7%	32-8%	51 -14%
III sphere Statements 29-53	218 - 38%	124 - 22%	64 - 11%	59 - 10%	110 -19%